

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application.

Applicant appreciatively notes that claims 1-3 are allowed, claims 4-10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections, and claims 5-9, 11, and 12 and would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim any intervening claims.

Claims 4-12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, claim 4 has been amended to recite "propagating a previous position to the current position." Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to insert "information" after "heading". Claim 6 has been amended to be dependent on claim 1. Claim 10 has been amended to include propagating a previous position to the current position as claimed in the preamble. Regarding claims 14 and 15, steps a) and b) are carried on when the vehicle is moving and not moving. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 13-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 5,862,511. Claims 13-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,111. Claims 13-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,692. Claims 13-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,532,419. Claims 13-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 U.S. Patent No. 6,308,134. In response, a terminal disclaimer is being submitted concurrently herewith, and accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Morgan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6, 564, 148). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Morgan et al. is not prior art because it has a filing date of April 6, 2001, whereas the present application claims the priority of provisional application Serial No. 60/187, 552 filed

March 7, 2000. Accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 this rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et. al.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Morgan et al. is not prior art because it has a filing date of April 6, 2001, whereas the present application claims the priority of provisional application Serial No. 60/187, 552 filed March 7, 2000. Accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

Customer Number: 33308
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: January 5, 2004
KMB/jd